



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/726,617	12/04/2003	Manuel Buck	033972-002	5757

21839 7590 03/24/2005

BURNS DOANE SWECKER & MATHIS L L P
POST OFFICE BOX 1404
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER

ORTIZ, ANGELA Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1732

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/726,617

Applicant(s)

BUCK ET AL.

Examiner

Angela Ortiz

Art Unit

1732

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 18-21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/4/03.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-17, drawn to a method of adhesion for windowpanes, classified in class 264, subclass 267.
- II. Claims 18-21, drawn to an article, classified in class 156, subclass 108.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different method including supplying the adhesive separately without the use of the frame as claimed.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

During a telephone conversation with Mr. Huguet on March 14, 2005 a provisional election was made with oral traverse to prosecute the invention of group I, claims 1-17. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this

Art Unit: 1732

Office action. Claims 18-21 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74

Art Unit: 1732

(Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). In the present instance, claim 11 recites the broad recitation of 1-20 minutes, and the claim also recites 1-10, preferably 1-5 minutes which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.

Claim Construction

Note that the preamble language has been construed as intended use and thus not further limiting the claim, and has not been given patentable weight in making the rejections below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1- 6, 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kramer, USP 5,196,153.

The cited reference teaches the claimed method of adhesion of a glass pane with a frame structure comprising the steps of providing a pane of glass 3 on a supporting member 7, and pressing a frame-like structure 1 into contact with the pane of glass 3 such that a sealing lip or peripheral skirt 8 presses the face of the pane of glass 3. An adhesive 2 is injected through the frame-like structure against the pane of glass 3. The

Art Unit: 1732

adhesive is hardened as desired. With respect to claims 2-4 and 8, note that the undercut annular grooves are concave, and also individual sealing lips and note the configuration of frame 7 as depicted in figures 1 and 2. Note that the passage 12 is provided with two outlets. With respect to claim 6, note that vents passages 14 are provided. Note that the undercut grooves are completely filled with adhesive 2. See col. 3, lines 15-20, 3-57; col. 4, lines 10-25; figures 1 and 2.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 7, 9, 11-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kramer, USP 5,196,153.

The cited primary reference substantially teaches the basic claimed method of adhesion of a glass pane with a frame structure comprising the steps of providing a pane of glass 3 on a supporting member 7, and pressing a frame-like structure 1 into contact with the pane of glass 3 such that a sealing lip or peripheral skirt 8 presses the face of the pane of glass 3. An adhesive 2 is injected through the frame-like structure against the pane of glass 3. The adhesive is hardened as desired. With respect to claims 2-4 and 8, note that the undercut annular grooves are concave, and also individual sealing lips and note the configuration of frame 7 as depicted in figures 1 and 2. With respect to claim 6, note that vents passages 14 are provided. Note that the undercut grooves are completely filled with adhesive 2. See col. 3, lines 15-20, 3-57; col. 4, lines 10-25; figures 1 and 2.

The cited primary reference does not set forth a frame of elastic material, pressing the glass, or the specific materials as claimed.

With respect to claims 7 and 12-15, note that the specific materials as claimed are equivalent to those disclosed in the applied prior art and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to so include any conventional material when performing the process, depending on the choice of the practitioner, the desired product properties and the material availability.

With respect to claim 9, note that the glass is supported by 7, and is pressed upon when the frame is held in contact therewith using chuck means 4. it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to so press the glass by applying pressure for firmly holding the glass in place.

Art Unit: 1732

With respect to the claimed configuration of the one opening as set forth in claims 16 and 17, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to so configure the opening within any number of conventional shapes, depending on the intended use of the opening.

Conclusion


The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. USP's 3037810; 3263014; 4561625; 4737335; 5779956; 5935356; 6086695.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Angela Ortiz whose telephone number is 571-272-1206. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 9:00-6:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Colaianne can be reached on 571-272-1196. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1732

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Angela Ortiz
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1732

ao